DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 461 651 SP 040 496

AUTHOR Magliaro, Susan G.; Dika, Sandra L.; Greene, H. Carol; Lubbs, Gresilda T.

TITLE Preparing Tomorrow's Leaders through the Redesign of Professional Preparation Practices.

PUB DATE 2001-04-01

NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Seattle, WA, April 10-14, 2001).

PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Administrator Education; Cooperative Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Instructional Leadership; Leaders; *Leadership Training; Lifelong Learning; Preservice Teacher Education; Problem Solving; Teamwork

ABSTRACT

This paper describes an experimental course that modeled a teamed approach in preparing future school leaders centered on teacher professional development. Participants included representatives from the key stakeholder groups in teacher professional development (beginning and experienced teachers, future teacher educators, and future administrators). The course engaged participants in modeling the collaborative problem solving that is evident in schools which function as true learning organizations. Data collection included field notes, wall charts, and daily discussion from the course. The paper describes course design and history; articulates processes used to facilitate class planning and problem solving discussions; presents the group's ideas for redesigning professional development practices for teachers; and summarizes the implications of this kind of experience for improving preparation and professional development programs for teachers and administrators. Results of the study suggest that administrators cannot assume student teachers receive all the information necessary to teach, and lifelong learning is essential for teachers to remain vital and effective across their careers. Administrators are critical catalysts in ensuring a rich learning environment for teachers in the schools. Effective education must occur in an environment based on mutual trust, respect, and sense of community. (Contains 30 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Susan G. Magliaro

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ED 461 651

Preparing Tomorrow's Leaders through the Redesign of Professional Preparation Practices

Authors:
Susan G. Magliaro, Sandra L. Dika, H. Carol Greene, Gresilda T. Lubbs,
Virginia Tech

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA
April, 2001
Contact Person: Susan G. Magliaro (sumags@vt.edu)

SP030414

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PREPARING TOMORROW'S LEADERS THROUGH THE REDESIGN OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION PRACTICES

Overview and Purpose

Administrators and teachers in successful restructured schools operate as teams solving the day-to-day problems in the school milieu (Darling-Hammond, 1997; Darling-Hammond & Sykes, 1999). Teams are responsible for all components of the school's daily operations. No longer is there a divide between the administrators and the teachers as work is structured for direct communication and collaborative decision-making. The purpose of this paper is to share an experimental course that modeled this teamed approach in the preparation of future school leaders centered on the topic of teachers' professional development. Our participants included representatives from the key stakeholder groups in teacher professional development: beginning and experienced teachers, future teacher educators, and future administrators, with each person representing a different stakeholder group holding varied, and sometimes conflicting goals. By using the research on what we know about schools and how schools *ought* to operate coupled with the realities of putting knowledge into practice (Sarason, 1991, 1993), our course engaged the participants in modeling the collaborative problem solving that is evident in schools that function as true learning organizations (Senge, 1990). The participants engaged in the realities that school leaders must face in the design and implementation of professional development programs in a manner that promotes action, collegiality, intellectual discourse, and change.

This paper focuses on the process and products that emerged from the course experience. The specific objectives are to:

1. describe the course design and history within a newly-created graduate degree

program for school leaders,

2. articulate the processes used to facilitate the class planning and problem solving discussions,
3. present the group's ideas for the redesign of professional development practices for teachers, and
4. summarize the implications of this kind of experience for the improvement of leadership preparation and professional development programs for teachers and administrators.

Perspective

School leadership requires the professional to articulate a vision, nurture shared ownership, and engage in short- and long-term planning (Leavitt, 1986). In addition, leaders must manage the context for change by negotiating demands and resources in the school environment, as well as solve problems in a thoughtful and on-going manner (Louis & Miles, 1990). In fact, Smith and Andrews (1980) found that "strong instructional leaders" spent almost 41% of their time on program improvement. Fullan (1991) states that the key role of the effective school leaders is transformation of the school's culture. Leithwood and Jantzi (1990) suggest that strategies such as fostering professional development, engaging in direct and frequent communication, and sharing power and responsibility promote transformation.

As a key component in school transformation, a professional development program must assume a comprehensive approach planned by school leaders including principals, staff developers, and teachers (Richardson, 1999). By assuming this team approach, educators become agents of change (Smylie, Bay, & Tozer, 1999), rather than gatekeepers for stability and status quo (Fullan, 1991).

In the effort to capitalize on decades of research on school change and the preparation of school leaders for school transformation, the teacher education and educational leadership departments in a large Research I university redesigned their school leaders' program to prepare principals and supervisors for the 21st century. A central feature of this interdepartmental program is collaborative problem-based learning, with teams of educators learning about and developing plans for the real problems of school leadership. For the experience described in this proposal, teachers' professional development was the focus.

Methodology[1]

The methodology undergirding this inquiry is based in the qualitative tradition. It represents a constructivist approach to research (Lincoln & Guba, 2000), and emphasizes the primacy of the meaning that the experience or activity has for the participants. Consequently, the analysis is an interpretive account of the processes and products of this course, as seen through the eyes of the participants, some of whom also happen to be the authors of this paper.

Participants and Setting

Five graduate students and one tenured faculty member were the primary participants in this experience. Four out of the five graduate students are doctoral candidates, two in teacher education, one in educational leadership, and one who is enrolled in both teacher education and educational leadership programs. One student was seeking a master's degree in instructional technology with the intention of staying in a teaching position. The four doctoral students are experienced teachers representing all levels from elementary through higher education in various

[1] The primary participants in this study decided to formally study our experience after the course had begun. While the course itself was being evaluated by the leadership program designers (i.e., the secondary participants), the actual process was not initially part of the inquiry. However, as the course developed, we (i.e., the primary participants and also co-authors on this paper) discovered that the process was worth studying. Consequently, we conceptualized a preliminary examination of this kind of approach to leadership preparation, with the hope to continue our inquiry as the program developed and was implemented.

areas of teaching including general elementary education, technology, foreign language, English as a second language (ESL), art, music, and teacher education. The faculty member is a teacher educator, with specializations in educational psychology and instructional design. She has also taught in public schools in general and special education contexts.

Secondary participants included faculty from the educational leadership program, the director of the teacher education center, and the associate dean in charge of education programs. Their participation basically occurred at the front-end design phase of the course, ensuring that the course aligned with the leadership program's values and goals, as well as the teacher education program's values and goals.

The seminar was held in a summer session, meeting three hours a day, four days a week, for four weeks (16 total sessions). All of the sessions were held in a seminar classroom, equipped with Internet access for "just-in-time" resource searching.

Data Sources and Collection Procedures

The primary data sources included field notes, class discussions recorded via audio-tapes from the last eight class sessions, and group-generated ideas recorded on flip chart paper (hereafter called "wall charts"). Secondary sources included electronic mail correspondence and student written proposals on the redesign of teacher education programs. The field notes were generated by the course instructor across the four weeks. The audio-taped recordings were initiated mid-way through the course at the point when the class participants proposed that we study our process and what we learned from it. A tape recorder was placed in the center of the seminar table cluster; the discussions from eight class sessions were recorded from start to finish. The wall charts, begun the first day of class, were posted on the walls and afforded us a permanent record of ideas, recommendations, actions, and reflections as they were developed

throughout the 16 class sessions. The papers and electronic correspondence were not analyzed systematically, but used to support findings from the primary sources.

Data Analysis

Field notes, wall charts, and daily discussion provided initial analysis. Transcripts were made of all taped recordings and wall charts were converted into text documents. A content analysis of the data technique was used to flesh out themes and recurring patterns of meaning. Data displays were created to facilitate viewing of the "full data set" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 92) and to compress and order data.

Trustworthiness

Our purpose was to be ethical, accurate and logical (Stake, 1995). Our support for credibility is from the triangulation of sources, peer review of findings, and member checking (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Stake, 1995; Merriam, 1998). We used the primary and secondary data sources to confirm (and disconfirm) our interpretations of the data. We all reviewed the first transcript in order to determine a consistent approach to analysis. We each then identified specific domains related to either the process or content of the course. We analyzed the data sources related to the topics, then presented our findings to the group for verification. Member checking was built into the process because we could affirm interpretation of our words and actions since we all participated in the course as well as in the analysis.

Results

Our results emanate from a preliminary analysis of this experience. To set the stage, we l first recount the course history and design. Then we explain our analysis of the process as determined from the transcripts from the discussions and field notes. The understandings about the redesign of teacher education programs depict the content that we found most important to

consider as future leaders. These understandings are organized according to the major questions that Gary Griffin (1999) posed to the field in the 98th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, entitled The Education of Teachers:

1. How should teachers be taught?
2. What should teachers be prepared to do?
3. Who should teach?
4. Where and when should teacher education take place?

We close the paper with a summary of implications from our findings, as well as ideas for future study of the preparation of our future educational leaders.

Course History and Design

Prompted by a reorganization of certification requirements for school personnel by the Virginia Department of Education, Virginia Tech's Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies (ELPS) and Department of Teaching and Learning (T&L) began a six-month planning process to redesign the school administrator program. The program designers initiated this process with the understanding that an essential feature would be the collaboration of faculty who traditionally educate teachers. The major goal was to create a cohesive educational program for school leaders who would view schools as learning organizations for all of its participants rather than as buildings to be managed.

Meetings were held every two weeks and focused on curriculum, instruction, and implementation issues. The planning committee consisted of four ELPS faculty (two from general education and two from special education contexts), two T&L faculty (one who specializes in evaluation and supervision and one educational psychologist), and one ELPS graduate student. Based on the conversations on teacher supervision and professional

development, it became clear that one of the important curricular components was an intense study of the education of pre- and practicing teachers.

The decision was made to develop a graduate seminar on the education of teachers and to invite graduate students who were studying to be administrators and teacher educators to participate. The enrollment in this experimental seminar would be kept small (i.e., fewer than 10) so that the participants would essentially serve as formative evaluators on the goals and content of the seminar. The lead instructor for the seminar is a faculty member in T&L, the department that usually takes the lead in teacher education. Other faculty who served as advisors for content and format included the one ELPS faculty member who led the administrator program design effort, the director of our Center for Teacher Education, and our Associate Dean for Graduate Studies.

The actual design of the course was a seminar approach with the students and instructors working as co-participants in responding to Griffin's (1999) four central questions about teacher education identified at the beginning of this section. Additionally, the theme, "The role of administrators in teacher education" was also a consistent point of discussion as it cut across each of these questions and was central to the overall goal for the administrator program.

A developmental perspective on teacher learning was the frame for our study of the education of teachers (Steffy, Wolfe, Pasch, & Enz, 2000). This perspective recognizes that teachers are qualitatively different at different stages in their career and consequently need qualitatively different content and experiences to promote learning. Further, we assumed a constructivist stance toward professional development (e.g., Richardson, 1999), and a corresponding collaborative approach to the design of learning experiences (e.g., Robb, 2000) that paralleled the programmatic approach we were taking to the education of administrators.

Process

According to Senge et al. (2000, p. 76), the most effective practice for team learning emerges from dialogue, involving

- becoming aware of our assumptions,
- expressing our assumptions so that we and others can see them, and
- inviting others to see new dimensions in what we are thinking and saying and to do the same for others' assumptions.

We used this dialogue model in the process of learning about teacher education. The inquiry process in the class was characterized by interruptions, questions, writing personal notes and group notes on wall charts, and movement around the classroom. Our process of inquiry had two loops (see Figure 1). The inner loop involved a repeated cycle of reading research literature, reacting to that literature, and integrating the literature with personal stories. This cycle resulted in reflective writing, the outer loop. This double-loop cycle was repeated each week during the seminar. The process fostered, and in turn, was facilitated by trust, respect, and a sense of community.

In the analysis of the transcripts, six broad categories of tools were used:

- emotional reactions,
- stories,
- metaphors,
- images,
- think aloud, and
- open inquiry.

We fleshed out the character and substance of the tools, and found commonalities between them. Through our analysis in class and our meta-analysis of the class process, we established a common mental model (Senge et al., 2000) about the reality of teacher education.

Emotional Reactions

We felt comfortable expressing emotions in class dialogue by surfacing our assumptions about teacher education and professional development. For example, this conversation took place after listening to some tapes on professional development from a national educational laboratory.[2]

S2: You know when I read all this and I listened to those tapes…

T: Did you? Did you get angry? RRRRR….

S2: You know what I thought – I thought I didn't realize how much under fire teacher education programs really are until I became a part of one.

A wide range of emotions; including frustration, hate or dislike, disappointment, happiness, excitement, alienation, love, concern, and caring; were evidenced in the taped conversations. We had emotional reactions to ideas and philosophies, to the situations we were currently involved in, to the situations "in the schools", and to the readings studied in the class.

[2] For quoted conversations from the tape transcript, T refers to the teacher, and the codes S1 through S5 refer to the students participating in the class.

Stories

We told three main types of experiential stories in class dialogue: (a) personal; (b) others'; and (c) institutional. Personal experience stories were based on the multiple roles of class members as students, teachers, and teacher educators. Our student stories were about our experiences in K-12, in preservice teacher education, and in graduate school. Our teacher stories included stories about our experiences with administrators.

S4: We went through school renewal and everyone was very unhappy with the principal because he had done some real odd things and hadn't done too much but water the plants. I mean he just strolled in … no matter what time of day you walked by the office, he was reading the newspaper…

S5: …it's on the front page of the paper and it's a huge article…it was one administrator, Ralph Jones*, who's just a champion for his teachers and the curriculum and instruction person in the school board.

Our third person stories were about the experiences of teachers, students, and teacher educators. Public and private K-12 schools as well as higher education institutions were the subjects of our institutional stories. Our stories had multiple purposes: to shock, to entertain, to inform, to encourage, and to diffuse intense situations.

Metaphors

We used metaphors to describe our assumptions and to express new dimensions in what we were saying. Our metaphors described learning about teaching, teacher education, research, teaching, teachers, professional development, and our dialogue process.

---

* pseudonym

> …a teacher education program is kinda like making a pie, you know. You want to have something, but in order to have something you gotta make it. So you make the pie and then once you have the pie you know what you have, okay? Once you have the pie, then you want to slice it into different parts that are gonna make up the whole pie, which is again going back to the idea of construction and deconstruction.

We spent a great deal of time exploring our own metaphors of teaching.

> T: Why do you use the metaphor "in the trenches"?
>
> S4: That's just what we have always called teaching. You know that we always used to say that the university people were there in their ivory tower where everything was perfect and everything was easy and they just didn't know what it was like to be there in the trenches lying in the slime and the mud.

We revisited the war/trench metaphor throughout our conversations.

Images

Imagery was an important tool in class dialogue. Our images described educational theory and philosophy, administrators, teachers, and teacher education.

> T: Actually, there were many issues that we used to deal with that were professional issues but they always got reinterpreted as being those selfish teachers.

We also created images about what we were doing through our inquiry into teacher education and professional development.

> T: …so I see the motion of this being a case study for that first level of mucking around and finding out about change…

Thinking Aloud

A striking feature of the class transcripts was the evidence that group members felt comfortable thinking aloud. We thought aloud while talking about teaching and teacher education.

> S3: I see the teacher as an über-professional, which is, in certain ways, the teacher has his job defined…but it is actually more than that because -- I mean, you -- I'm trying to think. I don't know - see I'm thinking a lot of stuff, so, let me breathe, let me concentrate.

Thinking aloud permitted us to reveal our assumptions and to come to group understandings.

> S2: This is what I was thinking about last night is, we do all of this research -- let me get this out of my mouth -- we do all this research, we have all these findings and we think we know what would work…but we can't do anything…it's almost futile…the system needs to change.

Open Inquiry

Our inquiry served to clarify, question, and challenge each other's assumptions; to encourage rethinking our assumptions, and to negotiate new understandings. Rogers developed the advocacy/inquiry palette to illustrate the types of discussion in which groups engage (in Senge et al., 2000, p. 222). A balance of inquiry and advocacy involves questioning the reasoning behind others' statements and explaining the reasoning behind one's own statements.

> T: Don't you think you can build…a program in which evaluation and criticism is a …natural part of the normal operating procedures rather than this sort of thing that's stuck out on the side which really is an artificial component…?

We had never before experienced this level of inquiry in other teacher education or educational leadership classes, and it contributed to unique and meaningful individual and

collective learning. It is important to reiterate the role of the process in fostering and facilitating trust, respect, and a sense of community.

Course Content

An analysis of the various data sources informed our thoughts and ideas related to Griffin's (1999) questions about teacher education, and how the role of administrators needs to be reconceptualized in the teacher education enterprise. This section is organized according to the questions and our ideas about the role of administrators.

How Should Teachers Be Taught?

We determined that creating a culture of inquiry was the first step toward the design of exciting learning environments for both teachers and students, as well as the foundation on which other professional development experiences are built.

We discussed several approaches to teaching teachers, all of which centered on the notion of inquiry and spanned the developmental continuum of learning to teach. They included:

- presentation of dilemmas and problem-based activities;
- service-learning opportunities and social justice conceptions in which belief systems and prior experiences and knowledge may be challenged;
- collaboration with peers to extend and refine knowledge and skills;
- reflective opportunities;
- presentation of and emphasis on multiple perspectives, challenging teachers to think "outside the box;"
- development of teacher-as-researcher; and
- encouragement of critical thinking and dialogue.

Finally, we placed an emphasis on teacher autonomy and ownership of

learning and professional development. The idea emerged that creating a culture of inquiry begins with preservice preparation and continues throughout the years of teaching practice. This stance would foster a thirst for learning and knowledge growth that is true and vital, persisting across the career span. We concluded that meaningful professional development and learning emerge from the needs and interests of the teachers within the context of their own particular school and community.

What Should Teachers Be Prepared To Do?

We determined four major areas for teacher education programs, including:

- working with students with diverse needs,
- learning the practical aspects of teaching,
- knowing the self, and
- learning what it means to care in teaching.

Within these four broad areas are the more specific notions of knowledge and skills that are necessary to be a teacher. The specific knowledge and skills within each of these four areas are elaborated below.

Working with students with diverse needs. One of the most challenging aspects of teaching is meeting all learners' needs. We determined that teachers have the responsibility and privilege of becoming agents of change in their classrooms and beyond, but being aware of various backgrounds and cultures is a precursor to being able to do so. We discussed various ways in which this notion could be fostered in teacher education. Our conversations revealed this could be accomplished in the following ways:

- provide multiple perspectives,
- offer opportunities to discuss and experience social justice issues, and

- take part in service-learning experiences.

Learning the practical aspects of teaching. This component deals primarily with preservice teacher education and the ways in which we concluded teacher education programs could provide the best learning experiences. Those include:

- apprenticeships,
- practice-based experiences,
- presentation of dilemmas,
- immersion, and
- interdisciplinary and collaborative learning experiences.

Knowing the self. Prior experience and prior knowledge play a very important role in learning any new information. We determined it is necessary for teachers to know themselves in terms of their motivations, concerns, and biases in order to be a caring and effective teachers. Teacher education programs could foster this capacity by providing:

- experiences that challenge belief systems,
- time for reflective opportunities, and
- learning that allows teachers to experience meaningful knowledge construction.

Learning what it means to care in teaching. Teaching is a fundamentally human enterprise. It involves working with people in a personal relationship, nurturing their growth and development. Although we saw caring as a human dimension of mutual respect and concern for others in teaching, we also adopted Noddings' (1999) conception of the idea of caring through such things as:

- service-learning opportunities,
- social justice issues,

- caring within the context of competency, and
- teachers being agents of change.

Who Should Teach?

The role of teachers has changed noticeably over the past twenty years in terms of self-perception, as well as in terms of how they are perceived by others in the school system (administrators) and by those in the community (parents). As we discussed who should teach, we realized the scope and realm of who teachers are and what they do. It became vividly clear that the teaching profession encompasses many facets, and that it is difficult to judge who is or is not "good teacher material."

As we brainstormed about who should teach, our list was informed by the writing of Noddings (1999), Darling-Hammond et al. (1999), and Cochran-Smith (1999). Throughout the course, it became increasingly apparent that the question of, "Who should teach?" is not to be answered easily and glibly. Teaching is a complex profession that is not to be taken lightly (Richardson, 1999). By the end of the course, we had formulated a list that suggested that those who teach should possess:

- pedagogical knowledge,
- practical knowledge,
- content knowledge,
- caring within the context of competency,
- interpersonal skills,
- classroom management techniques,
- concern for society, and
- passion for learning.

These competencies are reflective of Shulman's (1986) areas of expertise in which he defines types of teacher knowledge in terms of content, pedagogical content, and strategy. He also describes forms of knowledge in terms of propositional, case, and strategy.

When and Where Should Teacher Education Take Place?

Like Lieberman and Miller (2000), we concluded that teachers' growth and development are facilitated by activities such:

- examining outside knowledge (e.g., research, reform ideas, conferences, workshops, speakers, books, and consultants)
- looking at student work,
- helping shape assessment tools, and
- reflecting on their own practice.

Our list of when and where teacher education should take place included locations such as:

- universities;
- learning communities;
- schools;
- community;
- apprenticeships;
- alternative programs;
- collaboration with colleagues;
- literature reviews;
- urban, suburban, and rural settings; and

- reflective practice.

In other words, teachers are shaped by these experiences as well as their own perceptions of these experiences.

The literature we read discussed the development of the teacher from the preservice stage to the expert stage (Berliner, 1986; Borko & Putnam, 1996; Sternberg & Horvath, 1999). Our class discussions used the literature as a starting point for creating a matrix of this developmental process, enriching the information with our own personal observations and experiences.

In trying to put a location on teacher learning in terms of time and space, we realized that it is more encompassing than the physical space of the university and the schools. We need to conceptualize the journey of learning to teach as :

- a process rather than a product;
- a constantly changing activity;
- a process that is never finished;
- a process that is different to every person who engages in it;
- a process that unites teaching and learning as inseparable entities;
- a process that can be characterized as alive or stagnant, depending on the person and the stage of life of the person; and
- a process centered on the individual needs of the learner.

<u>What Should be the Role of Administrators in Teacher Education?</u>

Our conversations addressed both the observed and ideal roles of administrators as related to teacher education. As teachers in public schools, each of us had stories about administrators. For some of us, we also had experiences as teacher educators, working with administrators as we helped preservice or beginning teachers learning to teach. These

experiences framed our visions of administrators. Our observed roles ran the gamut of leader to adversary. As leaders, we saw administrators serve as decision makers and as stewards of the school, ensuring a positive school environment and sound management of resources. Unfortunately, we also saw administrators as adversaries who tried to control teacher behavior by taking away autonomy and professional judgment, thus making teachers feel guilty about asking for resources for professional growth.

The ideal roles for administrators as related to teacher education were divided into three main categories:

- broker of opportunities,
- partner in inter-professional education[3], and
- liaison with the university.

Five separate roles emerged when defining the administrator as broker, causing this to be the most extensive perceived role:

- facilitator of creating time to talk about teaching, thus helping teachers feel connected to each other and their work, helping them generate new ideas, and helping them become more reflective and intellectual about their teaching;
- communicator of new trends who serves as instructional leader, promoting the power of inquiry in teaching;
- coordinator of mentoring for preservice and practicing teachers, identifying master teachers for mentoring, as well as facilitating time and opportunities for mentoring;

[3] McCroskey and Tobertson (1999) indicate that interprofessional education programs are "intended to broaden the student's exposure to other professions, both to develop a better understanding of multiple roles and to learn how to collaborate to improve service delivery" (p. 70). Interprofessional education for professionals in school settings involves teachers, administrators, teaching assistants, and other service providers in the school (e.g., social workers, nurses). Our experimental course was designed specifically for the interprofessional education of teachers and school administrators.

- provider of resources for teacher development; and
- advocate for teachers and standard-bearer for their good work;

As a partner in inter-professional education, administrators should participate as partners with teachers in professional development activities. They should collaborate as colleagues in study groups, in professional conferences, and, in the design of the school's professional development plan. This, of course, requires re-framing of the kinds of relationships alluded to in the above section on "observed" roles of administrators.

As a liaison with the university, administrators should be the initiators of projects that will benefit the school's students and teachers. Administrators should also work closely with the university on placements and orientation for preservice teachers. Essentially, administrators need to work with universities as partners in the teacher education enterprise. The work should not only focus directly on teacher education activities; it should also emphasize improvement of learning opportunities for students, thus ensuring that teachers have the tools to make the innovation happen.

We proposed that administrators should have the vision that the school is a place to learn to teach. Professional development would not be an addendum to educating students; it would be done in concert with educating students. All participants, including administrators, would be learners in the community of practice.

Discussion and Conclusions

Teaching and learning are complex, developmental activities that require reflection and collaboration We concluded that administrators cannot assume student teachers are given all the information necessary to teach for the next thirty years. Life-long learning is essential for teachers to remain vital and effective across their careers. Administrators must see teacher

education as a continuum, a process that is continually developing and changing as teachers progress from novice to experienced professionals (Ancess, 2001).

As suggested by the National Commission of Teaching and America's Future (1996), such a continuum begins with the recruitment of students into a teacher education program, segués into solid pre-professional grounding within a validated setting, and results in initial certification as a teacher. After initial licensure, new teachers continue to develop in a supportive teacher induction program that involves early career mentoring and evaluation for the first two years in the classroom. Following the induction period, teachers should have available a wide array of professional development activities that occur in and out of classrooms and that incorporate the principles and practices of effective teacher learning (Lieberman & Miller, 2000).

Given this complex scenario for the development of effective teachers, we concluded that administrators are critical catalysts in ensuring a rich learning environment for teachers in the schools – where all will be spending the majority of their careers learning to teach. Teacher education programs developed within the context of this course experience all had administrators as key participants in the planning, implementation, and evaluation processes.

As a result of our analysis, we offer the following suggestions that may be useful in the professional development of school leaders who have responsibility for teacher education:

- Teaching is a developmental process that occurs throughout the continuum of the career span; therefore, it is necessary that opportunities for professional development be provided on a continuing basis.
- Administrators are key figures in the design of teacher learning experiences and professional development.

- Effective education must take place in an environment based on mutual trust, respect, and sense of community.
- An inter-professional stance toward learning to teach will enhance the opportunities for teachers and administrators to learn from each other, and create schools that are learning organizations. Reflection will be an essential element of daily practice, and will be enhanced through collaboration amongst all who provide effective learning environments for our students.

Implications for Future Research

This preliminary study afforded us the opportunity to witness the value of collaboration and reflection as we examined the process of analyzing teacher education programs. Future plans include a continuing seminar to explore the utility of situating teacher education collaboratively within the scope of an educational leadership program.

References

Agar, M. (1986). Speaking of ethnography (Vol. 2). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Ancess, J. (2001). Teacher learning at the intersection of school learning and student outcomes. In A. Lieberman and L. Miller (Eds.), Teachers caught in the action:Professional development that matters (pp.23-44). New York: Teachers College Press.

Berliner, D.C. (1986). In pursuit of the expert pedagogue. Educational Researcher, 15(7), 5-13

Borko, H., & Putnam, R.T. (1996). Learning to teach. In D.C. Berliner & R.C. Calfee (Eds.). Handbook of Educational Psychology, pp. 673-708. New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1999). Learning to teach for social justice. In G.A. Griffin (Ed.). The education of teachers: The ninety-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp. 114-144). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). The right to learn: A blueprint for creating schools that work. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Sykes, G. (Eds.). Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan. M.G. with Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). The new meaning of educational change (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of culture: Selected essays. New York: Basic Books.

Griffin, G.A. (1999). Changes in teacher education: Looking to the future. In G.A. Griffin (Ed.). The education of teachers: The ninety-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp. 1-28). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Leavitt, H. (1986). Corporate pathfinders. Homewood, IL: Dow-Jones-Irwin.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1990, April). Transformational leadership: How principals can help reform school culture. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (2000). Teaching and teacher development: A new synthesis for a new century. In R.S. Brandt (Ed.), *Education in a new era* (pp. 47-66). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Louis, K., & Miles, M.B. (1990). Improving the urban high school: What works and why. New York: Teachers College Press.

McCroskey, J., & Robertson, P. J. (1999). Challenges and benefits of interprofessional education: Evaluation of the Inter-Professional Initiative at the University of Southern California. Teacher Education Quarterly, Fall, 69-87.

Merriam, S.B (1998). Qualitative research and case study applications in education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

cx

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook (2 ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Noddings, N. (1999). Caring and competence. In G.A. Griffin (Ed.). The education of teachers: The ninety-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp. 205-220). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Pugach, M.C., & Johnson, L.J. (1990). Developing reflective practice through structured dialogue. In R.T. Clift, W.R. Houston, & M.C. Pugach (Eds.), Encouraging reflective practice in teacher education (pp. 186-207). New York: Teachers College Press.

Richardson, V. (1999). Teacher education and the construction of meaning. In G.A. Griffin (Ed.). The education of teachers: The ninety-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp. 145-166). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Robb, L. (2000). Redefining staff development: A collaborative model for teachers and administrators. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Sarason, S.B. (1993). The case for change: Rethinking the preparation of educators. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sarason, S.B. (1991). The predictable failure of educational reform: Can we change course before it's too late? San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Senge, P., Cambron-McCabe, N., Lucas, T., Smith, B., Dutton, J., & Kleiner, A. (2000). Schools that learn: A fifth discipline fieldbook for educators, parents, and everyone who cares about education. New York: Doubleday.

Shulman, L.S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. Educational Researcher, 15(2), pp. 4-14.

Smith, W.F., & Andrews. R.L. (1989). Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Smylie, M.A., Bay, M., & Tozer, S.E. (1999). Preparing teachers as agents of change. In G.A. Griffin (Ed.). The education of teachers: The ninety-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp. 18-62). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Stake, R. E. (1995). The art of case study. London: Sage.

Steffy, B.E., Wolfe, M.P., Pasche, S.H., & Enz, B.J. (2000). Life cycle of the career teacher. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Sternberg, R.J. & Horvath, J.A. (1995). A prototype view of expert teaching. Educational Researcher, 24(6), 9-17.